

Remarks

Claims 1-12 as listed above are pending in the present application. Claims 1-8 and 12 are amended above to better clarify the claimed invention and to correct informalities.

No new matter is introduced herein.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-6 are objected to for informalities. The above amendments have eliminated any such informalities, thereby rendering such objections moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0047862 A1 to Aoki et al. (hereinafter “Aoki”). For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection does not apply to the claims as amended herein.

Independent method claim 1 has been amended above to incorporate the step of the emission by a first device--the device being monitored--of a monitoring request containing an identifier of the isochronous channel on which the device emits packets and a task descriptor specifying a task. As further recited in claim 1, execution of the specified task is triggered at a second device consequent upon the absence of data packets on the isochronous channel between at least two emissions of synchronization signals emitted by the network. Independent apparatus claim 7 has been amended to recite analogous language. The amendments to claims 1 and 7 are based on claims 2 and 8, respectively, as previously presented.

Aoki describes a network error detection and display system wherein when an error is detected in the network, a network error display apparatus displays one of several pre-stored error messages to a user. It is stated that the system can distinguish between an error of the receiving system on the network and an error within a device. (See Aoki, e.g., at Abstract.)

With respect claim 2, as previously presented, the Examiner contends that Aoki discloses the “emission of a monitoring request containing an identifier of the

isochronous channel transmitting the packets and a task descriptor,” and points to ¶ [0075] and FIGs. 14 and 23 of Aoki in support.

¶ [0075] of Aoki states as follows:

FIG. 15 is a diagram showing the relation between the command and response of the FCP of FIG. 14 in more detail. A node A and a node B are connected via an IEEE 1394 bus. The node A is the controller, and the node B is the target. In both the node A and the node B, a command register and a response register each having 512 bytes are prepared. As shown in FIG. 15, the controller conveys an instruction by writing a command message into a command register 93 of the target.

¶ [0077] of Aoki describes four kinds of commands: 1) CONTROL, for controlling the function from the outside; 2) STATUS, for inquiring about the state from the outside; 3) GENERAL and SPECIFIC INQUIRY, for inquiring whether support of a control command is present, from the outside; and 4) NOTIFY, for requesting the notice of a state change to the outside.

None of the commands described by Aoki, however, is “a monitoring request containing an identifier of the isochronous channel (on which the monitored device emits packets) and a task descriptor specifying a task,” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Aoki also describes the possible responses to the aforementioned commands:

As responses to the CONTROL commands, there are “NOT IMPLEMENTED”, “ACCEPTED”, “REJECTED” and “INTERIM”. As responses to the STATUS commands, there are “NOT IMPLEMENTED”, “REJECTED”, “IN TRANSITION”, and “STABLE”. As responses to the “GENERAL INQUIRY” and “SPECIFIC INQUIRY” commands, there are “IMPLEMENTED” and “NOT IMPLEMENTED”. As responses to the “NOTIFY” command, there are “NOT IMPLEMENTED”, “REJECTED”, “INTERIM”, and “CHANGED”. (Aoki at ¶[0078].)

None of the aforementioned responses, however, includes “triggering of the execution of the specified task consequent upon the absence of data packets on the isochronous channel between at least two emissions of synchronization signals,” as recited in claim 1.

While Aoki describes the handling of various errors (see, e.g., FIGs. 20-23), Aoki does not describe the monitoring of an isochronous channel used by a first device to emit data packets, wherein the monitoring is done by a second device in response to a request from the first device. With respect to errors on an isochronous channel Aoki states:

If there is a signal at step S42, then the processing proceeds to a step S44 and it is determined whether an ISO (isochronous) signal is an empty packet.

If the ISO (isochronous) signal is the empty packet at the step S44, then the processing proceeds to a step S45 and error display information to the effect that the packet is empty is set. (Aoki at ¶¶ [0128]-[0129].)

Thus, while Aoki describes the detection of an “empty packet” for an ISO signal and displays error information, it in no way teaches the emission by a device to be monitored of a monitoring request containing an identifier of the isochronous channel on which the device emits data packets and a task descriptor specifying a task to be carried out (in the event of a problem). Nor does Aoki teach the triggering by a second device of the execution of the specified task consequent upon the absence of data packets on the isochronous channel between at least two emissions of synchronization signals.

For the reasons set forth above, therefore, independent method claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Aoki. The above discussion also applies to amended independent apparatus claim 7, which recites analogous language. Pending claims 4-5, 8 and 10-12, which depend therefrom and recite additional limitations, are likewise not anticipated by Aoki, for at least the reasons stated above. The rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should therefore be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,310,859 to Morita et al. (hereinafter “Morita”). Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

The Examiner relies on Morita as allegedly disclosing a step of executing actions to resume the emission of data packets, as recited in claim 6.

Nonetheless, even if Morita were to teach what the Examiner purports, and even if it can be properly combined with Aoki, it does not overcome the deficiencies of Aoki discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. In other words, like Aoki, Morita does not teach the emission by a device to be monitored of a monitoring request containing an identifier of the isochronous channel on which the device emits data packets and a task descriptor specifying a task to be carried out (in the event of a problem). Nor does Morita teach the triggering by a second device of the execution

of the specified task consequent upon the absence of data packets on the isochronous channel between at least two emissions of synchronization signals.

As such, for the reasons stated above, independent claim 1 would not be rendered unpatentable by Aoki in view of Morita. For at least the foregoing reasons, therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 6, which depends from independent claim 1, is not rendered unpatentable by Aoki in view of Morita. The rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should therefore be withdrawn.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,322 to Sugihara (hereinafter "Sugihara"). Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

The Examiner relies on Sugihara as allegedly disclosing a counter of synchronization signals and the detection of a specified number of synchronization signals, and that such disclosure allegedly makes it obvious to use such a counter as contemplated by claim 9.

Even if Sugihara were to teach what the Examiner purports, and even if it can be properly combined with Aoki, it does not overcome the deficiencies of Aoki discussed above with respect to independent claim 7. In other words, like Aoki, Sugihara in no way teaches the emission by a device to be monitored of a monitoring request containing an identifier of the isochronous channel on which the device emits data packets and a task descriptor specifying a task to be carried out (in the event of a problem). Nor does Sugihara teach the triggering by a second device of the execution of the specified task consequent upon the absence of data packets on the isochronous channel between at least two emissions of synchronization signals.

As such, for the reasons stated above, independent claim 7 would not be rendered unpatentable by Aoki in view of Sugihara. For at least the foregoing reasons, therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 9, which depends from independent claim 7, is not rendered unpatentable by Aoki in view of Sugihara. The rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should therefore be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks presented herein, Applicant respectfully asserts that all pending claims, claims 1-12, are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and advancement of the present application to allowance are earnestly solicited.

A two-month extension of time fee is required with this amendment extending the time for response to the Office Action of March 4, 2009 to August 4, 2009. Please charge such fee and any other fee incurred by virtue of the filing of this amendment against deposit account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Olivier Bureller

/Reitseng Lin/
Reitseng Lin
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,804
609/734-6813

THOMSON Licensing LLC
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: August 3, 2009